

From: Diana Jacobs
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2003 11:57 AM
To:
Subject: COMMENTS California Water Plan.

Kamyar et al

Based on a quick review - I have the following comments, all on Chapter five:

1) By the way, your summary mislabeled the Ecosystem Restoration section, pp63-71

2) Eco section, continued:
concerning

"Scientific uncertainty--The Resources Agency should establish an independent science review process, available to all Agency departments, to help chart out the best available science with stakeholder participation.(Chapter 5, 5-71)."

This is too limiting - there is not one single best way to insure sound science. Independent scientific review is certainly important, but there is no single way to do that either. Furthermore, the Resources Agency is probably not in the best position to ensure good science single handedly. This should be rewritten to have the both CAL-EPA and Res Agency work with Departments (and Bds, Commisisions etc) to ensure/promote/enable independent science in decision-making. For example, the CALFED legislation sets up a very robust science program - Agency on top of that could not and should not overlay that with something else.

3) Watershed

"State agencies should pursue the goals and initiatives in the California Agency Watershed Management Strategic Plan (draft August 18, 2003). (Chapter 5, 5-211)."

I'm a little nervous about this given the following statement on the Join Arnold website:

"As Governor, I will direct Cal/EPA and the Resources Agency to completely overhaul their recent "California Watershed Management MOU" from a bureaucratic do-nothing document to an action plan that will clean up California's most endangered watersheds now."

Since the draft was never finalized and it refers to the MOU - is it more prudent to wait and see what life it will have?

4) Recreation

"Obtain secure and adequate funding through general obligation bond issues or other means to ensure that recreational components can be incorporated into the construction of new CALFED projects.(Chapter 5, 5-199)."

Shouldn't tbe clarified to say - large infrastructure projects or something like that? "Calfed Projects" as a category includes ecosystem restoration and small structures on private land etc - lots of things that may not be appropriate for public recreation

Thanks
DJ